## REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of September 20, 2006 in which claims 1-5, 7-25 were rejected and claim 6 objected to.

Regarding the indefiniteness rejection of claims 1-9 and 22-23, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite positive steps. Claim 22 has been amended to insert the phrase --bus width-- before the word "detector" in line 4. Also, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the method is not only "for detecting the bus witdth" but also for then "using" a peripheral device connected to an electronic device.

Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is requested.

Regarding the novelty rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-21 based on "SDMCS," the Examiner has responded to applicant's arguments at pages 9-11 of the Detailed Action and on page 11, the Examiner interprets the word "formed" as in some signal to come into being, i.e., creating/spawning some indicator, and not formed as in requiring a structure. Furthermore, the Examiner states that although the SDMCS reference is silent as to if there is any accessing of registers when selecting one of the modes, one can argue that when the host inquires with the peripheral devices, what modes does it support, and the peripheral devices answers to said query with an answer (SD and SPI modes), the peripheral had to look that information up in memory (register).

However, the host does not inquire the modes supported (SD/SPI) as it's known that all cards are supporting both modes. And thus the peripheral device does not need to check any direct or indirect register (or similar related). The host (with SD slot) blindly either starts with normal initialization in SD mode (1 bit default mode, host reads the register directly indicating the supported bus widths before setting a 4 bit bus active) or controls actively the card to SPI mode in prior to

SPI protocol access (fixed 1 bit bus). Thus, it is not considered that the SD specification would include any reading/utilization (by a host) of indirect indicators about the bus width supported by the media.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-21 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22 and 24 as being anticipated by US 2001/0021956 (*Okamoto et al*), please note that the *Okamoto et al* reference relates to a solution where a mode register directly indicates the bus width (for example paragraphs 29 and 27). In paragraph [0029] it is said that the card register file pre-stores, e.g, an operation mode.

The present invention differs from Okamoto et al in such a way that the supported width(s) are determined indirectly, e.g., by means of the value of a Spec_Vers field:

v.1.4-3.11=>1 bit
v.4.0-4.x=> 1/4/8 bit
v.5.0=>1/4/8/16 bit
etc.

The question is about indicating (i.e. telling) the supported bus width directly, whereas in the presently claimed invention focuses on indicating the supported bus width(s) indirectly.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22 and 24 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22 and 24 as being anticipated by *Hirabayashi et al* (US 6,481,629), the *Hirabayashi et al* reference relates to a solution where a card is set to either a 16-bit or Card Bus mode

by the user, and the host determines by means of a MODE signal which one has been set (column 6, lines 43-50). *Hirabayashi et al* also disclose at column 8, lines 1-9, that the card detects automatically the bus width supported by the host.

According to the presently claimed invention, such a host could instead determine the supported bus width(s) from a plurality of possibly bus widths (page 6, lines 9-10) supported by the card. The determination is performed indirectly from the register file (or the state of the defined I/O). *Hirabayashi et al* could not inform-with high and low signals-more bus widths than those two. Therefore, in the solution of *Hirabayashi et al*, the usage of signals more or less directly tells the supported bus width. Therefore, *Hirabayashi et al* does not anticipate the presently claimed invention. Withdrawal of the novelty rejection based on *Hirabayashi et al* is requested.

The applicant again notes the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 6 with appreciation but it is believed that the Examiner will be persuaded by the above remarks that all of the claims, as amended, are patentable, not just claim 6.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of September 20, 2006, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-25 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234